

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants wish to thank the examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative during a telephone interview conducted on (*****to be determined). A summary of the substance of the interview is included in the comments below.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-17 have been amended. Support for the amendments is provided at least in the original claims and paragraph [0048] of the specification.

Claims 1-12 and 17 were rejected, presumably under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Dapper (US 6,487,405). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Dapper in view of Buhrmann et al. (US 5,854,984). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Dapper in view of Buhrmann and Silver et al. (US 5,828,949). To the extent the rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Applicants note that Dapper focuses on the issue that a FFT and an IFFT perform similar signal processing. As shown in Fig. 71, Dapper discloses providing two identical components,

namely FFT2100, in a single communication system and using one for FFT calculation and the other for IFFT calculation.

The Applicants submit that Dapper does not disclose providing reconfigurable components or reconfiguring the baseband signal processing to be applied among a plurality of radio communication systems, as recited in base claims 1 and 17. More specifically, Dapper does not disclose reconfiguring only the part of baseband signal processors that executes processing differently among a plurality of radio communication systems based on programming data of a new radio communication system, upon switching radio communication systems, as now recited in claims 1 and 17.

Moreover, the portions of Dapper's disclosure cited by the Office Action (i.e., col. 35, lines 55-60, col. 37, lines 17-39, col. 39, lines 11-24, and col. 11, lines 41-51) relate only to the components executing baseband signal processing.

The Applicants submit that Buhrmann and Silver do not supplement the teachings of Dapper with respect to the above-mentioned feature distinguishing claims 1 and 17 from Dapper.


Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references, considered individually or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter defined by

claims 1 and 17. Therefore, allowance of claims 1 and 17 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Date: November 8, 2006
JEL/DWW/att

Attorney Docket No. L9289.05121
STEVENS DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
P.O. Box 34387
Washington, D.C. 20043-4387
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200